



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,495	11/14/2003	Patrick McCauley		9212

7590 08/11/2005
John R. Ross, III
Ross Patent Law Office
P.O. Box 2138
Del Mar, CA 92014

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, MARK A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3676

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/713,495

Applicant(s)

MCCAULEY, PATRICK

Examiner

Mark A. Williams

Art Unit

3676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 20-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 20-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 11, 12, 14-17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tesmer, US Patent 2,510,198. A bendable extension arm, comprising a stiffening wire 4 comprising a first end and a second end, two wire receptors (40, 10), wherein one of said two wire receptors is attached to said first end and the other of said two wire receptors is attached to said second end, and a sheath 6 covering said stiffening wire, wherein said sheath prevents over bending of said stiffening wire. Two ferrules are shown as claimed. Attachment means is provided (44, 12). The stiffing wire is rigidly attached to the receptors. The wire receptors are couplers, as claimed. Note that the arm of Tesmer is capable of being attached to any desired device, including a paintbrush and pole, as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tesmer. Tesmer discloses the claimed invention except for the specific material claimed. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device in this way, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416. See also *Ballas Liquidating Co. v. Allied industries of Kansas, Inc.* (DC Kans) 205 USPQ 331. Such a modification is not critical to the design and would have produced no unexpected results.

5. Claim 10 and 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tesmer in view of Kalidindi, US Patent 5,823,592, and in further view of Ficke, US Patent 3,357,035. Tesmer does not show a helically

constructed sheath, as claimed. Both Kalidindi and Ficke teach the concepts of a brush, pole, and helically constructed sheath. Regarding the helical sheath, it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made for one skilled in the art to have included in the design of Tesmer such modifications, as generally taught in both Kalidindi and Ficke, since such a modification is well known in the art and would have worked equally as well. The claimed method is inherent to the design.

6. Claim 5 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr in view of Kalidindi and in further view of Ficke. Tesmer shows a single stiffing wire. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Tesmer to include two threaded ends for attachment, as well as more than one stiffing wire, in the claimed manner, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8. Such a modification is not critical to the design and would have produced no unexpected results.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 and 19-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. After further consideration, the examiner has applied previously cited prior art.

Conclusion

This action is non-final.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark A. Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-7064. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

A handwritten signature, likely of the examiner, consisting of a stylized 'A' with a horizontal line and a small flourish at the end.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark Williams
8/6/05

MW



Suzanne Dino Barrett
Primary Examiner